



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,330	07/30/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-084	9174
45695	7590	10/28/2005	EXAMINER	
WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH			NAWAZ, ASAD M	
P. O. BOX 71355				
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/916,330	KIRKPATRICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6,7,15,16 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Request for Continuation filed on 8/22/05. Claims 1-41 were amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1-41 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: updateable should be replaced with updatable. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (USPN 5813017) further in view of Adamchick (USPN 5761668).

As to claim 1, Morris teaches a client-server computer system comprising: a client application server that utilizes data in a particular form and generates a validation request for validation of the data and wherein the request includes the data in an initial form, an application server accessible by a plurality of client application servers

via a plurality of application software protocols, wherein said application server provides a data validation service on the data received from the client application server in response to receiving the validation request from the client application server (abstract; col 6, lines 50-67) wherein the data validation service compares the data in the initial form to a reference for the particular form utilized by the client application to determine whether the initial form matches the particular form and returns to the same client application server that generated the validation request an indication of valid or invalid based on whether the initial form matches the particular form (abstract; col 6, lines 35-39; col 6, lines 50-67; delta difference file) and a storage mass coupled to said application server for storing a system of dynamically maintainable validation functions for performing said validation service (col 8, lines 43-59; backup servers and etc.).

However, Morris does not explicitly indicate wherein the validation includes checking whether a date specified in the data is in a valid format based on the number of digits that represent the year and further includes checking whether the date falls within a set range of dates.

Adamchick teaches the above-mentioned limitation by checking the format of the year and determining if the day is approaching the turn of a century (see abstract; col 4, lines 39-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Adamchick into those of Morris to allow the system to be standardized. Allowing the system to be standardized would allow the system to check the validity of the date and whether the request is even essential (by not falling into a set range of dates) thereby saving essential resources.

As to claim 2, Morris teaches a client-server computer system according to claim wherein said storage mass comprises a database (Fig 1, numerals 12 and 15; Fig 2, numerals 25-29)

As to claim 4 Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 2, wherein said database contains a table-based system of rules organized into at least three hierarchically-organized views.(Fig 2, numerals 25-29; col 9, lines 1-12)

As to claim 6, Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 2, wherein said database stores validation functions stored in hierarchically-organized views that are dynamically updateable by an external administrator (Fig 2, numerals 25-29; col 9, lines 1-12).

As to claim 8, Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 4, wherein said application server and said database are centrally located to said plurality of client application servers and said validation functions are maintainable by a remote administrator. (col 8, line 60 to col 9, line 12)

Claims 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are essentially the method, application server, system and method for the above-mentioned claims and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, 33, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (USPN 5813017) further in view of Official Notice.

As to claims 3, 5, 7, and 9, Morris teaches the method of claim 1 with validation functions represented by a storage schema maintainable by a remote administrator, a database containing a table-based system of rules organized into at least three hierarchically-organized views, wherein the storage schema is located centrally. However, Morris does not explicitly indicate that the schema is represented via LDAP. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use LDAP in a system as taught by Morris because LDAP is a standardized networking protocol designed for querying and modifying directory services. The IETF designed and specified LDAP as a better way to make use of directories having found DAP to be too complex for simple Internet clients to use.

Claims 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, 33, 35, and 39 contain similar limitations as the above-mentioned claims and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN

AMN

Saleh Najjar
SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER